

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 13th January, 1976

No. 12941-4 Lab-75/1231.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Fine Wires (P) Ltd, Palwal:

**BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 207 of 1974

between

**SHRI RAM SARUP, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S FINE WIRES (P)
LTD., PALWAL**

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/74/39804, dated 12th December, 1974, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Fine Wires Private Limited, 69-New Grain Market, Palwal and its workman Shri Ram Sarup to this Tribunal, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Sarup was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Whereas the workman appeared before me on 30th September, 1975 in response to the notice of reference, none appeared for the management on that date despite service of notice of reference with the result that the *ex parte* proceedings were taken up against the latter on that date.

The workman appeared as his own witness today in *ex parte* evidence and deposed that he worked as a Welder with the respondent for a period of little more than one year and that his services were terminated by the latter on 5th May, 1975 without sufficient cause and without holding domestic enquiry. He added that he remained un-employed from the date of termination of his services till today despite having made efforts to get the employment.

I see no reason to disbelieve the workman particularly when the proceedings against the management are *ex parte* and they have not taken care to defend the demand raised by the workman on them. I, therefore, relying on the statement of the workman hold that his services have been terminated by the management with effect from 5th May, 1975 without justification.

I, as a result of my finding made above, further hold that the workman is entitled to reinstatement with effect from 5th May, 1975 with continuity of service and full back wages. I return the award accordingly.

Dated 7th November, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 99-4Lab-76/1233.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Shri Bharat Basain Limited, Plot No. 8, Industrial Area, Faridabad:

**BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 190 of 1973

between

**THE WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SHRI BHARAT BASAIN LIMITED.
PLOT NO. 8, INDUSTRIAL AREA, FARIDABAD**

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/73/44589, dated 22nd November, 1973 the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Shri Bharat Basain Limited, Plot No. 8, Industrial Area,

Paridabad and its workman to this Tribunal, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :--

- (1) What should be the minimum rates of wages payable to various categories of workers?
- (2) Whether the workers should be paid dearness allowance linked with the Consumer Price Index Numbers? If so, with what details?

The parties put in their appearance in response to the notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings giving rise to the following issues:-

- (1) Whether the demand, the subject matter of the present reference, is vague and, therefore, merits dismissal?
- (2) Whether Shri Ram Murti Sharma has no locus standi to sign the claim statement on behalf of the workman concerned?
- (3) Whether the demand, the subject matter of the reference, was first raised on the management and rejected by it? If not, with what effect (on workman)?
- (4) Whether there has been a settlement under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the workmen and the management? If so, what is that settlement?
- (5) What should be the minimum rates of wages payable to various categories of workers?
- (6) Whether the workers should be paid dearness allowance linked with the consumer price index Number? If so, with what details?

The case was fixed for 19th December, 1975 for recording evidence of the workman when the later absented himself. Even Shri Ram Murti Sharma authorised representative for the workman who had filed the statement of claim on behalf of the later on 11th April, 1974 and continued to represent him thereafter was not present on that date despite the case being adjourned on his request on 6th October, 1975 to enable him to have instructions from the workman.

The absence of the workman and his authorised representative on the date of hearing fixed in the reference, and their failure to adduce evidence on the issues framed despite many opportunities being granted to them well led to a conclusion that the workman was not interested in pursuing the demand raised by him on the management leading to this reference and there was now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication.

I hold accordingly and answer the reference while returning the award in terms of may finding arrived at by me.

Dated 29th December, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Paridabad.

No. 13162-4Lab-75/1235. -In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s United Steel and Allied Industries, Bahadurgarh:-

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 31 of 1975

Between

SHRI MAYA RAM AND THE MANAGEMENT OF SHRI PROMODE SJNGH CONTRACTOR
M/S UNITED STEEL AND ALLIED INDUSTRIES, BAHADURGARH.

AWARD

By order No. TD/RK 17-E-25 2933-92, dated 10th May, 1975 of the Governor of Haryana in the following dispute between the management of Shri Promode Singh Contractor M/s United Steel and Allied

industries, Bahadurgarh and its workman Shri Maya Ram was referred for adjudication to this court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Maya Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?"

The workman appeared in response to the notice of reference sent to him and made a statement on 24th October, 1975 that he had no claim against the management and withdraw the demand made by him earlier on the later resulting in this reference.

It is thus obvious that there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I accordingly return a no dispute award with no order as to costs.

Dated 7th November, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 100-4Lab-76/1237.— In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Usha Die Casting Private Limited, Mehroli Road, Gurgaon :—

**BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 174 of 1974

between

**SHRI LAL CHAND, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S USHA DIE CASTING
PRIVATE LIMITED, MEHROLI ROAD, GURGAON.**

AWARD

By order No. ID/GG/139-B-74/36617, dated 7th November, 1974 the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Usha Die Casting Private Limited, Mehroli Road, Gurgaon and its workman Shri Lal Chand to this Tribunal, in exercise of the power, conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ?

Whether the termination of services of Shri Lal Chand was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The parties appeared in this Tribunal in response to the notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings.

The workman alleged, *vide* statement of claim filed by him that he had been orally appointed as a timekeeper by the management on 14th July, 1973 without their issuing any appointment letter and that his services had been terminated illegally by the latter with effect from 1st June, 1974, without holding an enquiry and in contravention of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act. He stated that the management issued an appointment letter, dated 10th June, 1974, subsequent to the date of his actual appointment and anti dated it as 13th July, 1973 thereby tampering with the actual date appearing thereon.

The management filed their written statement with the plea that the workman failed to serve a notice of demands directly on them before taking the matter to the Conciliation Officer, in order to constitute a industrial dispute and such the reference was bad in law and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the same. On merits of the case they pleaded that the workman had been appointed on probation for the period of 2 months with effect from 14th July, 1973, and an

appointment letter with the condition that his services could be terminated at any time during the probationary period without assigning any reasons and that his services were terminated by the management before the expiry of the period of his probation on their finding his work unsatisfactory.

The workman reiterated the allegations made by him in the statement of claim in the rejoinder filed by him and controverted the plea of the respondent with result that the following issues were framed on the pleas of the parties,—*vide* order, dated 16th January, 1975 :—

- (1) Whether the demand, the subject-matter of the present reference was first raised by the management and rejected by it before taking up the matter for conciliation? If not, with what effect? (on workman)
- (2) Whether Shri Lal Chand, workman concerned was a probationer? If so, with what effect?
- (3) Whether the termination of services of Shri Lal Chand was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

I have heard the authorised representatives for the parties and seen the record with reference to the evidence led by them. I decide the issues as under :

Issue No. 1.

I for the reasons stated by me in detail in my order, dated 10th October, 1975 in reference No. 71 of 1974, *S. C. Sethi vs. M/s Kirlosker Oil Engine, Mathura Road, Faridabad* hold that it was no longer necessary for the workman to raise a demand directly on the management and for the latter to reject it, before the matter was taken to the Conciliation Officer, in order to constitute an industrial dispute. I decide this issue accordingly.

Issue No. 2.

This is an important issue in the case inasmuch as on the failure of the management to prove the appointment of the workman on probation, the workman, admittedly succeeded. The management examined Shri R. L. Malik their accountant as M. W. I in order to prove this issue and relied on the appointment letter Exhibit W-7 alleged to have been issued prior to the date of joining of service by the workman. I have carefully seen this document. The figure three (3) encircled with blue ink at mark 'A' and at mark 'B' is undisputedly an over writing and this circumstance lends corroboration to the case put forth by the workman that the year 1974 was changed into 1973 by the management much after his actual appointment on 14th July, 1973. This conclusion is found further corroborated by the writing recorded in hand in blue ink and underlined by me with red pencil at the end of first paragraph reproduced as under:—

"With references to your application and subsequent interview you had with us you are appointed as Time keeper on the following terms and conditions with effect from 14th July, 1973."

Reading the first paragraph of the appointment letter Exhibit W-7 as a whole, the writing underlined by me with Red pencil, "with effect from 14th July, 1973" appears to be a surplus age and redundant, inasmuch as this should have been recorded immediately after the words "time keeper" as used in the sentence and not after colon succeeding the words on the following terms and conditions.

There is yet another interesting feature of the case in support of the plea of the workman about the management having made material alteration in the appointment letter Exhibit W-7. This would be obvious on perusal of the written statement filed by the management showing that initially they had pleaded the appointment of the workman with effect from 13th July, 1973 and subsequently made alteration in this plea by writing in blue ink "14th July, 1973" over the typed date 13th July, 1973 at different places. It seems that this idea occurred to them after they fabricated the writing with effect from 14th July, 1973" in the appointment letter Exhibit W-7 to make it inconsonance with their pleas. All these facts and circumstances led me to an conclusion beyond out that the appointment letter Exhibit W-7 and its duplicate Exhibit M-1 were materially altered by the management subsequently and that these documents initially bore the dates as 13th July, 1974 and did not bear the words "with effect from 14th July, 1973" I am thus convinced that the letters Exhibit W-7 and M-1 were prepared on 13th July, 1974 much after the actual date of appointment of the workman, as alleged by the workman and not on 14th July, 1973 as pleaded by the management. The existence of the undated signature of the workman at mark A of the duplicate Exhibit M-1 of the appointment letter, does not in any way nullify the stand taken by the workman, that the appointment letter was prepared on 13th July, 1974.

In absence of any appointment letter, before or about the actual date of appointment of the workman on 14th July, 1973, he shall be deemed to have been appointed on permanent basis and not on probation and the plea covered by this issue casting a heavy burden on the management to substantiate their case, remains unestablished. I therefore decide this issue against the management.

Shri R. L. Malik examined as M. W. ; while stating that the appointment letter W-7 and its duplicate M-1 were prepared on 13th July, 1973 and not on 13th July, 1974 admitted that the workman was discharged from service on account of his having become surplus. It would appear that this statement is inconsistent with the plea of the management that his services were terminated on the ground of his unsatisfactory work, during his probation period under the conditions of his appointment, *viz.* letter Exhibit M-2. The plea of the management taken in the written statement is thus found contradicted by their own witness instead of being corroborated and the result is that the whole fabric spun by the management is found torn into pieces.

I am thus fully satisfied that the workman had been appointed on a permanent basis on 14th July, 1973 and his services were terminated by the management,—*vide* letter Exhibit M-2 unjustifiably and that he is entitled to be reinstated with continuity of his service. I hold accordingly and direct that the workman shall be reinstated with effect from 28th June, 1974 the date of termination of his services, with continuity of his service. In absence of any specific issue and evidence of the workman on record in respect of his having remained unemployed during the intervening period he shall be entitled to payment of back wages from 28th June, 1974 to the date of his reinstatement conditional on proof of his having remained gainfully unemployed during this period, in a subsequent claim in respect thereof. I answer the reference while returning the award in terms of my finding arrived at by me.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 94-4Lab-76/1239. —In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Arch Industries Corporation Private Limited, Mathura Road, Faridabad:—

**BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 27 of 1974

between

**SHRI ANUGRAH NARAIN SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S
ARCH INDUSTRIES CORPORATION PRIVATE LIMITED, MATHURA ROAD,
FARIDABAD**

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/73/5648, dated 5th March, 1974, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Arch Industries Corporation Private Limited, Mathura Road, Faridabad, and its workman Shri Anugrah Narain Singh to this Tribunal in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Anugrah Narain Singh, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The management did not put in their appearance in this Tribunal on 8th October, 1975 despite service of notice of reference sent to them and as such were proceeded with *ex parte* on that date. The workman putting in his appearance on that date through Shri Darshan Singh his authorised representative was directed to adduce his *ex parte* evidence on 26th December, 1975

Neither the workman nor the management put in their appearance on 26th December, 1975 leading to a conclusion that the management were not able to substantiate their justification of the termination of services of the workman and the burden of proof of the dispute as referred to this Tribunal remained undischarged.

I accordingly hold that the termination of services of the workman Shri Anugrah Narain Singh was unjustified and that he is entitled to reinstatement with effect from 8th October, 1973. He shall be entitled to his back wages conditional on proof of his remaining gainfully unemployed from 8th October, 1973 till the date of his reinstatement. I thus answer the reference while returning award in terms of my findings.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Dated the 30th December, 1975.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1823, dated 31st December, 1975

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Dated the 31st December, 1975.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 103-4 Lab-76/1241.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/S Saraswati Rubber Works, behind Police Lines, Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 45 of 1975

between

SHRI ARUN KUMAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SARASWATI
RUBBER WORKS, BEHIND POLICE LINES, GURGAON

AWARD

By order No. ID/GG/170-A-74 12812, dated 7th March, 1975 the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Saraswati Rubber Works, behind Police Lines, Gurgaon and its workman Shri Arun Kumar to this Tribunal, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Arun Kumar was justified and in order?
If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The workman appeared in this Tribunal on 22nd December, 1975 in response to the notice of reference sent to him. The management however could not be served for that date.

The workman absented himself on 23rd December, 1975 the date fixed in the reference, for filing of the statement of his claim. His absence on the date of hearing fixed in the case indicated that he was not interested in the demand raised by him on the management leading to this reference and there was now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication.

I hold accordingly and answer the reference while returning the award in terms of my finding arrived at by me.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Dated the 29th December, 1975

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 13071-4Lab-75/1243.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Escorts Ltd. 19/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

**BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 185 of 1973

between

**SHRI R. C. KALRA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M S ESCORTS LTD., 19/6
MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD**

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/73/406/40817, dated 10th October, 1973, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Escorts Ltd., 19/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri R. C. Kalra to this Tribunal, in exercise of the power conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of service of Shri R. C. Kalra is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Usual notices of the reference being sent to the parties. The management put in their appearance and the workman did not appear despite personal service of the notice made on him two times. *Ex parte* proceedings were, therefore, taken up against the workman.

Shri P. C. Aggarwal, Assistant Manager Personnel, Escorts Ltd, Plant II, Faridabad, made an *ex parte* statement that Shri R. C. Kalra was employed as a Supervisor drawing salary at a rate of Rs. 82/- P. M. and as such was not a workman and the reference made is thus bad in law. I see no reason to disbelieve the statement of Shri P. C. Aggarwal particularly when it is corroborated by the documentary evidence and the proceedings against the workman are *ex parte*. I as such relying on his statement hold that Shri R. C. Kalra was not a workman on the date of alleged termination of his services and the reference is bad in law and that he is not entitled to any relief on this ground. I return the award accordingly,

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1715, dated 13th November, 1975.

Dated the 13th November, 1975.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 15th January, 1976

No. 13242-4Lab-75/1518.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Raunaq Malleables, Faridabad.

**BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK**

Reference No. 17 of 1972

between

**SHRI RAMESHWAR PARSHAD AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S RAUNAQ MALLEABLES,
FARIDABAD**

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/762-A-71/306, dated 5th January, 1972 of the Governor of Haryana the following dispute between the management of M/s Raunaq Malleable, Faridabad and its workman

Shri Rameshwar Parshad was referred for adjudication to this court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Rameshwar Parshad was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The parties appeared in this court in response to the notices of this reference sent to them. The management filed the written statement in reply to the notice of demand served on them by the workman.

Whereas the workman alleged that his services had been terminated with effect from 24th August, 1971 without sufficient cause and he was entitled to reinstatement from that date with continuity of service and full back wages, the management pleaded that he had voluntarily abandoned his job,—*vide* resignation duly accepted by them and that the reference was otherwise invalid for want of an industrial dispute between the parties and that Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act was *ultra vires* of article 14 and other provisions of Constitution of India.

The following issues were thus framed on pleas of the parties,—*vide* order, dated 29th June, 1972.

1. Whether the reference is invalid for the reasons given in para No. 1 of the written statement?
2. Whether constitutional validity of section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act can be challenged in this court ?
3. Whether the workman resigned the post and his resignation was accepted ?
4. If issue No. 3 is not proved whether the termination of his services was justified ?

The management examined Shri Nandu Singh their Driver an attesting witness of the resignation Exhibit M. 1 of the workman brought by them on record besides Shri S. S. Dhingra their Time Keeper. Shri Nandu Singh deposed that he attested the resignation Exhibit M. 1 tendered by the workman before the management in his presence. Shri S. S. Dhingra stated that the workman brought the resignation Exhibit M. 1 to him and told him that he wanted to settle his accounts and that he thereafter took him to the Personnel Officer Shri B. K. Akhori who accepted the resignation and directed clearance of accounts of the workman. He added that a sum of Rs. 75/95 was paid to the workman against voucher Exhibit M. 2 duly signed by him (workman) in his presence after the accounts were checked.

Nothing could be brought in cross-examination of any of these witnesses leading me to suspect their evidence, found so strongly corroborated by the documentary evidence, Exhibit M. 1 and M. 2. The workman failed to adduce any evidence in rebuttal despite a number of opportunities being given to him in that behalf, so much so, he failed to appear in the witness-box and absented himself on 26th September, 1975 and 23rd September, 1975 the dates of hearing fixed in the case, to make his statement.

The irresistible conclusion under the circumstances is that the plea of the management relating to the resignation of the workman and satisfaction of all his claims is correct and justified in all respects. The management did not press the pleas covered by issues Nos. 1 and 2. I accordingly decide issues Nos. 1 and 2 against the management and issue No. 3 in their favour and hold on issue No. 4 that in view of my finding on issue No. 3, the services of the workman cannot be said to be terminated and that he is not entitled to any relief. I return the award accordingly with no order as the costs.

Dated the 12th November, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 2950, dated 19th November, 1975.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated 12th November, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.